

REMARKS

Claims 1-44 are pending. No claims are allowed. Claims 1, 27, 33-35, and 39-41 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and these remarks.

1. Interview summary

The applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesy of a telephonic interview on September 4, 2003. During the interview, independent claim 1 and its dependent claims were discussed in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,278,449 to Sugiarto et al ("Sugiarto"). The Examiner suggested amending claim 1 to recite "simultaneously presenting a plurality of variations of the image." Applicant agreed to amend some of the claims (claims 1 and 27) as suggested by the Examiner and suggested other amendments. As detailed below, Applicant believes that the amendments do not raise new issues, because limitations similar to the amendments have been previously presented.

2. Rejections under section 102

Claims 1-5, 18-30, and 33-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Sugiarto. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 1, as amended, recites a method of preparing an image. The method includes retrieving current user settings reflective of desired settings for compressing the image, deriving alternative compression settings, and substantially simultaneously presenting a plurality of variations of the image to the user where each variation is generated using one or more alternative compression settings.

Sugiarto discloses allowing a user to set different compression ratios for selected web page components (col. 6, lines 45-58). Sugiarto discloses a single target screen 570 (FIG. 6) in which the user can review a simulation of what the selected components will look like with current compression ratios. Sugiarto, however, clearly fails to disclose substantially simultaneously presenting a plurality of variations of an image, as recited in the claim.

Therefore, claim 1 is in allowable form. Claims 2-5 and 18-26 are dependent claims depending from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 27, as amended, recites a computer program including instructions for causing a computer to substantially simultaneously present a plurality of variations of an image to the user where each variation is generated using one or more alternative compression settings. As discussed above with reference to claim 1, Sugiarto fails to disclose substantially simultaneously presenting a plurality of variations of the image. Therefore, claim 27 is in allowable form. Claims 28-30 are dependent claims depending from claim 27, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 27.

Claim 33, as amended, recites a method that includes receiving a number specifying how many variations of an image are to be generated, and using alternative compression settings to generate a plurality of variations of the image including as many variations as specified by the received number. Sugiarto discloses generating one variation of the image each time a user selects Refresh Target button 625, but fails to disclose generating a plurality of variations including as many variations as specified by a received number. Therefore, claim 33 is in allowable form. Claims 34-38 are dependent claims depending from claim 33 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 33.

Claim 39, as amended, recites a computer program including instructions for causing a computer to receive a number specifying how many variations of an image are to be generated, and use alternative compression settings to generate a plurality of variations of the image including as many variations as specified by the received number. As discussed above with reference to claim 33, Sugiarto fails to disclose generating a plurality of variations including as many variations as specified by a received number. Therefore, claim 39 is in allowable form. Claims 40-44 are dependent claims depending from claim 39 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 39.

Applicant submits that the amendments to the claims do not introduce new issues. For example, original claim 21 and previously presented claim 38 provide substantially simultaneously presenting a plurality of variations of the image. Claim 21 depends from claim 1, which recites a plurality of variations of an image where each variation is generated using one or more alternative compression settings. Claim 21 recites displaying the image at current user defined compression settings along with three variations in a four-up orientation on an output device (i.e., simultaneously presenting multiple variations of the image). Claim 38 depends from claim 33, which recites using alternative compression settings to generate a plurality of variations of an image. Claim 38 recites concurrently displaying two or more of the plurality of variations of the image (i.e., simultaneously presenting multiple variations of the image).

Furthermore, previously presented claim 18 provides receiving a number specifying how many variations of an image are to be generated, and generating a plurality of variations of the image that includes as many variations as specified by the received number. Claim 18 recites that presenting a plurality of variations includes receiving a selection that defines a number of variations that are to be presented and generating the number of variations selected.

2. Rejections under section 103

Claims 6-8, 16, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiarto in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,012,068 to Boezeman et al ("Boezeman"). The Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claims 6-8, 16, and 17 are dependent claims depending from claim 1. As discussed above with reference to claim 1, Sugiarto fails to disclose substantially simultaneously presenting a plurality of variations of an image. Boezeman is equally lacking.

Boezeman discloses automatically determining location and type of requested media (abstract). Although Boezeman discloses a display device 23 (FIG. 1) for displaying a user interface, it fails to disclose substantially simultaneously presenting a plurality of variations of an

Applicant : Douglas E. Meisner et al.
Serial No. : 09/300,348
Filed : April 27, 1999
Page : 14 of 14

Attorney's Pocket No.: 07844-334001 / P308

image. Because neither Sugiarto nor Boezeman discloses the above limitations, claims 6-8, 16, and 17 are in allowable form.

Claims 9-15, 31, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiarto in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,748,763 to Rhoads ("Rhoads"). The Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claims 9-15 are dependent claims depending from claim 1. As discussed above with reference to claim 1, Sugiarto fails to disclose substantially simultaneously presenting a plurality of variations of an image where each variation is generated using alternative compression settings. Rhoads is equally lacking.

Rhoads discloses hiding an identification code signal in noise created by image compression techniques such as MPEG or JPEG. However, Rhoads fails to disclose substantially simultaneously presenting a plurality of variations of an image where each variation is generated using alternative compression settings. Because neither Sugiarto nor Rhoads discloses the above limitations, claims 9-15 are in allowable form.

Claims 31 and 32 are dependent claims depending from claim 27. As discussed above with reference to claims 27 and 9-15, neither Sugiarto nor Rhoads discloses substantially simultaneously presenting a plurality of variations of an image where each variation is generated using alternative compression settings. Therefore claims 31 and 32 are in allowable form.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 9/15/2003



Ferenc Pazmandi
Limited Recognition under 37 CFR § 10.9(b)

Fish & Richardson P.C.
500 Arguello Street, Suite 500
Redwood City, California 94063
Telephone: (650) 839-5070
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071
50169584.doc